

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

b). REMARKS:

Examiner objects to both the form of the claims as they exist, and the potential conflict with existing art, as taught in Fukushima and/or Budner. It is proposed to Amend the existing Claims 1 - 19 as indicated following this REMARKS section, to bring the Application into compliance with patent law, and to preserve the patentability of the core idea, which is that emulsifier-free, solvent-free cleaning and/or polishing compositions are surprisingly easy to make, not requiring solvents or emulsifiers.

REMARKS CONCERNING SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

Below is a discussion of some of the specific objections Examiner raised to the then-existing Claims 1-19.

Examiner objected (p. 2.) to the presence of paraffinic, olefinic, etc. solvents in the Claims. It should be pointed out that the presence there is to further define what "solvent free" (Claim 1) means, not that their presence is claimed as part of the instant invention. It should be noted in regard to this confusion that the structure of Claim 1 has been altered such that the sub-claims utilize alphabetical delineations to try to make it clearer.

Examiner objected (p. 2.) to the presence of the additives: thickeners, taste deterrents, etc. in certain of the Claims. By changing the nature of Claim 1 from "comprising" to "consisting essentially of", it is to be understood that the additives are not necessary for the instant invention to work. Also, it should be pointed out that their (optional) presence is mentioned in the Specification on p. 4.

Examiner objected (p 2.) To the possibility that the drying oils that potentially find utility in the instant invention may be boiled, bodied or otherwise processed. This objection is valid, and the Claims have been modified appropriately.

Examiner objected (p 2.) to the presence of certain emulsifiers. All references to emulsifiers have

Application/Control Number 09/848,666 - Office Action 1 Response

been removed from the revised Claims.

Examiner objects (p. 3) to the existing Claims "as being indefinite, in failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention" (pp 3ff.)

In particular, the presence of a drying and/or non-drying oil was alleged to be indefinite (p. 3). The references to drying oils have been deleted from the Claims as herein proposed to be amended.

Likewise, the presence of synthetic and/or natural-origin oils was alleged to be indefinite (p. 3). The references to synthetic oils have been deleted from the Claims as herein proposed to be amended.

Examiner objects (p. 3) to the wording of existing Claim 6. The proposed amended Claim 7 adopts essentially the wording that examiner proposed as being clearer.

Examiner objects (p. 3) to the claimed processed drying oils as being indefinite. All references to drying oils has been removed from the Claims as herein proposed to be amended.

Examiner objects (p. 3) to several typographic-type errors (p. 3) in the Claims, such as "preservative" being present more than once in Claim 1, calcium carbonate being listed more than once in Claim 12, and "other" being misspelled in Claim 16. These corrections have been duly noted and corrected in the Claims as herein proposed to be amended.

The format of Claims 18 and 19 are alleged to be incorrect, making them improper claims. The wording has been modified as proposed by examiner.

REMARKS CONCERNING THE OBVIOUSNESS OBJECTIONS

We contend that there are substantial differences in the prior art cited by the Examiner and the

Application/Control Number 09/848,666 - Office Action 1 Response

instant invention. To summarize the differences between the amended Claims and Budner and/or Fukushima:

- Budner and Fukushima require as essential ingredients water and emulsifying agents. The amended Claims, in the spirit of the original Specification, provide cleaning/polishing compositions that specifically do not require the emulsifying agents. It is this surprising find, that the compositions of the instant invention do not require these seemingly-critical ingredients, that it is desired to patent. That is what is desired to be claimed in the revised Claims.
- Fukushima is essentially about eucalyptus oil- or cineole-containing compositions, that due to the presence of the cineole, impart microbial resistance to the treated articles. In no way does Fukushima teach that the oils disclosed in the instant invention will allow the production of emulsifier-free vinegar/oil/wax combination. They are specifically excluded from the teaching of Fukushima, because they do not contain cineole in appreciable quantities.
- Budner specifically lists several ingredients as being critical to his invention, mainly
 - Stearate salts (Col 3, L41) (these are emulsifying agents).
 - Stearyl alcohol and/or hydrogenated castor oil (C3L41).These are excluded from the Claims as amended herein.

SUMMARY OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

In light of the objections of the Examiner, and in attempt to clarify the Claims, the following types of changes have been made:

- The claims are narrowed to exclude non-natural-origin or drying oils,
- The claims are re-structured to indicate more clearly that oil/wax polishes and

Application/Control Number 09/848,666 - Office Action 1 Response

- oil/wax/vinegar cleaner/polishes are envisioned,
- The claims are restructured to exclude water as an ingredient apart from acetic acid, the purpose of the two being to emulate natural vinegar,
 - All references to emulsifying agents have been removed as they are really not necessary, and
 - The language of the claims is much more restrictive, changing the most important of the "comprising" portions to "consisting essentially of".

In addition, it has been attempted to clarify the language that the Examiner found objectionable or confusing. It is hoped that these changes will make the Application acceptable to the Examiner.

The proposed amended claims follow. Please note that the enumerating system for the sub-claims in Claim 1 have been re-assigned to be letters, in order for the structure of this claim to be made clearer.

The proposed amended specification also follows. Some examples and discussion were deleted from the original specification.

It should be noted that to the best of our knowledge and belief, there is no new matter introduced into the Claims or Specification as amended herein.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.